R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 978 JC 670 816

REPORT ON THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON THE NATURE AND DEMANDS OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TEACHING (5TH, BENNETT COLLEGE, MILLBROOK, NEW YORK, JUNE 12-17, 1967).

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80 18P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE TEACHERS, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *FACULTY EVALUATION, *ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITY, CONFERENCE REPORTS, TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS, INTERPERSONAL PROBLEMS,

THIS REPORT PRESENTS THREE CASE STUDIES OF DIFFICULT CAMPUS PERSONNEL PROBLEMS TO BE CONSIDERED FROM THE POINTS OF VIEW OF FACULTY, DEPARTMENT HEADS, AND ADMINISTRATORS. THE DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO THESE SITUATIONS OCCUPIED PART OF THE WEEK. OTHER TOPICS COVERED WERE THE VARIOUS BARRIERS TO COMMUNICATION (INDIVIDUAL, SOCIAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL), STUDENT VS. ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY, THE PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF FACULTY FOR THE 2-YEAR COLLEGE, AND THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES. DETAILS OF PLANNING THE CONFERENCE ARE GIVEN AS A POSSIBLE GUIDE FOR OTHERS TO FOLLOW. (HH)

ERIC

ED014978

REPORT ON THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON THE NATURE AND DEMANDS OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TEACHING, HELD AT BENNETT COLLEGE, MILLBROOK, NEW YORK

JUNE 12-17, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM T PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINI STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATIO POSITION OR POLICY.

It is a pleasure to be able to announce that the Fifth Annual Conference was a professional success from the participants' viewpoint, an educational success from the viewpoint of the senior staff who regularly learn a great deal from the participants, and a financial success as witnessed by the fact that we were able to leave a balance of approximately $450 toward the Sixth Annual Conference.

I. Planning

The planning for this Conference was made easier because the participants in 1966 had suggested both a theme and the structure for developing it. During the fall, Donald Eldridge and Irene Kiernan worked on those suggestions, which seemed both valuable and practical. Following our usual pattern, notices of the Conference were sent out to college Deans and Presidents in January and March. In addition, these notices were sent to all of the 1966 participants who were to serve as communicators to prospective participants in case the notices were "lost" on the administrators' desks.

The second pre-conference step was harder. True to the predictions of teaching faculty, the quota established for administrators was filled long before the second notice went out in March. Registration for administrators continued to come in both from presidents (who were specifically excluded in the first notice) and other administrators. Some colleges registered directly by sending their fees to Miss Loysen; others reserved places by card to Dr. Kiernan. Because of this overlapping, we learned on the week before the conference that we had thirty-four registered deans and other administrators, although our quota had been set at 25.

Then, on the second day of our conference, we learned that an additional 20 participants held the title of department or division chairman. They had registered as "teachers" in a subject area, and, indeed, most of them do teach at least one course and honestly conceive of themselves as faculty. Some seemed surprised and a trifle abashed when they found out that full-time teaching faculty consider them "administration." This brought to light a problem in our own communication, that is, we had not defined "administrator." The participants this year defined as an administrator anyone who had responsibility for decisions on hiring, firing and evaluating teachers, and who are not full time in the classroom.

Thus, while we went over the 100 mark for participants this year, 54 of us were "administrators." This fact confirmed the stereotype in the minds of some faculty that administrators send themselves to conventions and do not offer the same opportunities to faculty. Administrators pointed out that in some cases they offered the opportunity to attend to faculty, but had been turned down because graduation exercises had been held, and faculty were off on vacation. One dean humorously told us that he had not wanted to come either but that his president had insisted that the college have some representation. Only one college reported that their representatives had been elected by the faculty as a whole.

Evidently, problems in communication could be (and they were) discussed in the context of just such situations. The cases prepared by President Eldridge, Roger Garrison and Irene Kiernan were not really necessary to get discussions started.

JC 670 816

II. Staffing

We added two new senior instructors to our staff: Mary Jones of the Fashion Institute of Technology and Frank Casey of Marymount College (Virginia). William Leader and Richard Crosby felt that their four years as senior instructors had been valuable, and that the opportunity should be opened to new instructors. They had served from 1963 to 1966. Betty Bentley of Cazenovia concurred in this idea, and she had resigned for the 1968 year. Irene Kiernan, having served for two years as director, will join Roger Garrison (also a former director) as a consultant for next year. Sister Pauline Apuzzo of Marymount College (Virginia) was selected as the director for 1968. This also is in accordance with our plan to rotate positions in the senior staff to give opportunities to the group.

Moreover, this year Donald Eldridge helped us initiate observations of participants who might serve in coming years as directors, consultants, and senior staff in similar projects throughout the country. We held a meeting with eight such participants to discuss tentative plans for establishing similar conferences throughout the country. Under such a plan, the Bennett Conference might in the future serve as a training ground for these regional directors.

The participants saw as one drawback the fact that one of the values of the present set-up is that we can share experiences with colleagues from a variety of geographical backgrounds, and that conferences throughout the country would be more limited to particular areas with similar problems and outlook. On the other hand, an advantage would be that more teachers could participate in regional conferences because travel could be minimized. With the great expansion of two-year colleges, and the shortage of teachers, it seems urgent for more conferences to be held.

III. Reading Materials

This year we did not send any reading lists or books to participants in advance of the conference, nor did we have a keynote speech. Since Irene Kiernan had to be absent the first evening, Roger Garrison introduced participants to the week. We distributed three case studies (cf. attached) and these were either directly or indirectly part of each day's sessions. In addition, we gave each participant a copy of Roger Garrison's new book, Junior College Faculty.

IV. Points of View

Our hypothesis that deans, chairmen and faculty would tend to see problems in different lights appeared to be valid. We did not apply regular and rigid standards to all three cases studied, but the evening reports on the first case showed clearly some of the distinctions. For example, in Case 1 the deans as a whole tended to have a harsher judgment of the department chairman (Mrs. Alpha) and to be more sympathetic with the supportive of Mr. Beta (faculty) than were the groups which were comprised largely of teaching faculty. Teachers were stricter with Mr. Beta, and blamed him for his "gadfly" approach. The chairmen saw positive aspects in both Mrs. Alpha and Mr. Beta. Moreover, as a solution to the problem, teachers recommended "counseling" from the dean to both Mrs. Alpha and Mr. Beta; chairmen recommended an "orientation" for new teachers and a stricter definition of channels of communication and organizational structure with the dean taking responsibility for acting as catalyst and

mediator; and the deans felt that Mr. Beta should go to another college where his experimental approach to teaching would be rewarded and not punished by Mrs. Alpha, whom many thought of as incorrigible.

We cannot analyze differences in approach in the other cases because after the first full day, some of the groups included both administrators and teachers. One teacher-group steadfastly held to the set structure of having no administrators until Friday. Other groups broke down barriers either fully the first day, or by degrees. It is interesting to note that the strongest pressure for meeting in integrated groups came from administrators rather than from faculty. There appeared to the senior instructors to be some basis for the teachers' fear that administrators would tend to restrict discussion, if for no other reason than that they would dominate in mixed groups. When administrators first joined teacher-groups, there was some tendency for them to "take over" at least at the beginning with, of course, the early tacit permission of faculty who allowed them to do so. In one group, a member reported on "teasing" which originally occurred in the mixed group and "kidding" which continued. It was hard to judge whether or not the underlying basis for "teasing" was recognized. These early symptoms were reported to disappear in later meetings.

If there could be said to be one central thrust in the meetings on faculty-administrator communication, it appeared to be some distrust by faculty of those whom they see as evaluating their performance and of excluding them from decision-making in areas vitally tied up with their professional growth and development. Thus, class size, hours of work, educational preparation, orientation on the job and evaluation of teachers and administrators were discussed within this realm. On the part of administrators (at least when they met alone) was a tendency to minimize the extent of dissatisfaction of faculty with their situation, a relegation of complaints to a "minority of dissidents," to consider "gripes" as healthy, and to feel that even when they are given an opportunity to do so, faculty do not participate actively and do not want to take responsibility equally with authority. There was some expression of concern with faculty asking for fewer teaching hours with little awareness of possible social and individual motivation for such requests, other than a desire to get out of hard work.

V. General Observations

It is impossible to go into detail on all of the subjects covered during the week.

In general, it was agreed that there are individual, social and institutional barriers to communication, and that these interfere with good teaching either because energy is diverted from the classroom into bickering, resentment and distrust, or because in good faith and without awareness faculty and administrators are pulling in opposite directions. Individual barriers include "insecurity" on the part of faculty who are "big men in the locker room" but fail to voice dissatisfaction to administrators who then cannot judge the extent and depth of a problem, and a tendency on the part of administrators to protect their own egos by refusing to try to uncover problems, no less to solve them. A clear statement of institutional purposes, regular re-evaluation of institutional purposes and structure designed to carry them out is essential. Policy and practice must also be reviewed and studied regularly.

An interesting new note was sounded in this conference. Those who have followed our conference carefully will note that four years ago, faculty were concerned about being evaluated by students. Now, this practice is better accepted and many colleges

consider it a means to improving teaching. There were few, if any, controversies over evaluation by students. However, there was some continued rejection of observation of faculty by chairmen and deans for the purpose of granting tenure and/or promotions. There was a definite trend toward preference for elected chairmen and evaluation of the qualifications and performance of chairmen and deans by faculty.

As might be expected, and resulting largely from Roger Garrison's report of his project on Thursday night, there was much discussion about the preparation of faculty for two-year colleges. These included statements pro and con the Ph.D., specialized training and orientation, the career goals of the faculty, professional growth and development on the job. The problem of faculty participation in policy-making was also discussed at length.

The structure and function of the American Association of Junior Colleges came in for its regular discussion, again, mainly as a result of the felt need of the participants for some organization through which they can express themselves. A desire for more "voice" was expressed by both teachers and administrators. Clearly the concept of the American Association of Junior Colleges as an institutional service agency is not well understood or accepted.

VI. Plans for 1968

Starting on Thursday night, and going through Saturday morning, the senior staff and the participants singly and together gave serious attention to our conference for next year.

Briefly outlined, the 1968 conference is taking a direction toward a topic which might be stated: "The Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teachers." Within this general area, we would hope to discuss with teachers actually involved in the two-year college enterprise such things as: the selection and sources for recruiting two-year college teachers; preparation of (remote) and orientation of (proximate) the two-year college teacher; professional "maintenance," ongoing improvement and evaluation, and continuing motivation of the educator committed to the two-year college venture.

We hope to make the 1968 conference as "creative" an event as possible. Therefore, we would be interested to see if a project (e.g. the designing of a model orientation plan for faculty) might be wrought by the group during the course of the week at Bennett.

These and other ideas will take greater shape during the Fall, but we hope that, whatever be the agenda for the conference, a "guided resiliency" will continue to be the spirit characterizing the week in Millbrook.

VII. Conclusions of the Director

As director, I would like to add the following comment. This year I have been a dean of students, and thus have been able to refine and practice some of my ideas as to what a good administrator should be and do. I tried to "act out" my ideas in the position of director at the conference. It caused me some uneasy moments, because I was not sure that I could reach my objectives in so short a time, i.e., one week. Goals which I had in mind for myself during the week were:

1. To take care of the physical comfort of the participants, so that there would be minimum interference with learning. I knew I had the faculty, administration and staff of Bennett on my side, preventing problems and quickly stepping in to solve any which might occur. According to our participants we were successful in this. None of the participants went home early in the week in a fit of impatience or anger (as occasionally happened in the past).

2. To stay as much as possible in the background during the conference, allowing senior staff to participate fully in planning their individual sessions on a day to day basis, and the participants to bring out their own individual talents. It was gratifying to me to be able to evaluate this procedure as successful too. Of course, the risk was low because I knew the high professional calibre of my senior staff. However, I was pleased when participants came to me at the end of the meeting, and when several of them (5) wrote to me after the conference, specifically remarking that they had noted what I had done and complimenting me on this approach. One dean wrote to me, "Your behavior as an administrator, encouraging everyone to participate and to think for himself even when it was difficult and there was or could be criticism of yourself, taught me more about being a good administrator than I had expected from a week." A chairman said that he was impressed by my staying in the background, and not defending every criticism of the progress of the conference. "I think that when you didn't jump up to give an excuse, or an explanation, it made us think about what we were doing. We had to take responsibility for what was going on, and not just blame it on the boss."

We were also successful financially. In 1966, with 66 paying participants, five senior faculty, two consultants, and one director, we met a budget of $8,148.48. This enabled us to "break even" and to repay the slight deficit remaining to Bennett for the previous year. In 1967, we had six senior faculty (one of whom doubled as a consultant) and a director, with 96 participants. We were able to increase our payments to all of our staff, to pay $200 to the American Association of Junior Colleges for the books we distributed, to have $50 for incidentals which was not expended, to increase our "entertainment" budget, and to leave a balance of $449.10 toward next year's budget.

VIII. Evaluation and Recommendations for Next Year and the Future

1. We should eliminate the return card to the conference director, and maintain the registration form and fee which are sent directly to Miss Loysen at Bennett College.

2. We should continue the basic structure of this year, that is, eliminate a keynote speaker on the first afternoon and substitute an introductory meeting, followed by dinner, small group sessions and an evening hospitality hour. Other routines should be followed, but with a change in the content covered in the evening sessions and the omission of the Thursday afternoon "break." One of the uses of the left-over money could be the obtaining of a musical event for Wednesday evening.

3. We should continue a year-long search for senior instructors, preferably from former participants, to replace those who "retire" after service and to continue as a training ground for new instructors. Those named for the Thursday evening meeting were: David Randall, Marvin Barnum, Donald Ray, Philip Ward, Sister Suzanne (absent), Lawrence Milner, Karl Neuroth, Howard Simmons, and Marcus Farrell.

4. Reinstitute the daily reports (anonymous) and evaluations of each day's session by each participant. Although we eliminated the daily reports this year, it is noted with interest that about 20 percent of the participants voluntarily sent such statements to the director. Those who did so urged that we continue with case studies which directly or indirectly give some focus to discussions; and that we keep the format of the conference, with participants kept to 100 and small groups to 12-15 members. The written comments to the director and the verbal reports of the participants indicate that they felt that the conference was valuable because of the open exchange of attitudes and ideas.

5. The invitation for 1968 should ask for teaching faculty only. Administrators contribute to groups, but tend to dominate discussion as well as to outnumber teachers. Probably some quasi-administrators who carry large teaching loads will attend anyway.

6. Each participant should be given a blank name card for himself next year. He should print the name by which he wishes to be called, in large letters, preferably with a magic marker.

7. Senior staff should contact Roger Garrison during the summer, sending him any ideas they have on innovations in teaching, and on orientation programs.

8. Participants and/or staff who have ideas for implementing the conference in 1968 (cf. #VI. p. 4 for general outline) should contact Sister Pauline at Marymount College, Arlington, Virginia 22207 before October 1, 1967. The design for the conference is somewhat tentative, but suggestions for modifying it cannot be successfully implemented without adequate preparation on the part of director, consultants and staff.

9. Reading materials and/or case studies will be sent to 1968 participants ONLY if registrations can be completed early. Therefore, registrations with NAMES of participants should be sent to Adele Loysen at Bennett College as soon after April 1, 1968 as possible.

IX. Long-Range Need

The need for a training project for area directors, and for the spread of regional conferences over the country must be seriously considered by the American Association of Junior Colleges with support solicited from one or more foundations. We should not count on the four-year colleges and universities to train teachers for two-year colleges, especially when experiences show that the universities tend to do this in isolation from the realities of two-year college needs and circumstances. It is suggested that the present Bennett one-week conference be continued with nation-wide representation on an annual basis, but that a training program for regional directors also be operated at Bennett College, longer in duration and with participants carefully selected for their potentialities as directors of one-week conferences patterned after the Bennett idea in their own geographical areas.

Respectfully submitted,

Irene R. Kiernan

FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE

June 12-17, 1967

Nature and Demands of Two-Year College Teaching

Bennett College, Millbrook, New York

BRIEF "CASES" FOR DISCUSSION

The three situations, described briefly in the attached "case histories", actually occurred in three different two-year colleges.

As presented here, the material lacks sufficient detail and necessary background to be true case histories; and, further, the condensation is inevitably interpretative, possibly reflecting the bias of the person writing the summaries.

However, if you will accept these qualifications, please consider that the cases reflect - both in their stated terms - and in their more important unstated ones - essential problems in communication which must be solved by both faculty and administrators.

In your discussions, it is especially important that you speculate on the details of background, personality, and the real nature of the problem, and that you make a special effort to be aware of the grounds for your own speculation. Indeed, one of the frank purposes of a clearer awareness of the universality of certain difficulties in communication - whether your stance is administrative or faculty. (Both administrators and teachers will have a chance to compare reactions, reasons, and conclusions, arrived at independently, during the course of this conference.)

So that your discussions can be as pointed and relevant as possible, the following questions - returned to persistently - may be useful as guides:

1. What seems to be the root problem(s) in this case?
2. What are the outward signs (symptoms) of the problem?
3. What appear to be the chief causes of the problem(s)?
4. What will likely happen if the next-higher level administrator to whom this problem is presented either does nothing or glosses it over?
5. What are some possible solutions which the administrator should (could) put into effect?

    a. Would such solutions solve the problem immediately?
    b. Set the context and/or procedure for an orderly solution to evolve?
    c. Simply create a new and more complex set of problems?

Brief "Cases" for Discussion

*6. Most especially, ask yourself: What would I do in this case? (Note, too, that most problems develop in stages. Try to determine the probable steps in each problem and, at each step, where a point of decision - no matter how minor - has been reached. At each decision point, ask yourself: "What would I do here?")

NOTE: To keep your discussions from straying into areas not pertinent to these particular cases, please assume that economic factors are not involved, that salary, physical working conditions, and the like, are reasonably adequate, and that faculty (especially) understand and accept that the college is doing as well by them as budget and total situation permit.

All names used in cases are, of course, fictitious.

Case # 1
Faculty-to-faculty relationship

Place:

Malabar College, a community ("comprehensive") college of 2700 students (full time equivalent - about 900 of these being evening division), 115 faculty; located in inner suburban ring of industrial city of 125,000. New campus, academic and other space demands are satisfactory for at least the next three years. College is seven years old; started in temporary quarters for first three years in phased-out elementary-junior high building; new campus planned from scratch, occupied for four years.

Administrative Structure:

Junior college began as element of total public school structure, became autonomous district four years ago; non-political board of nine trustees, (five-year terms) made up of local business and professional men and two housewives (one former president of local PTA), College president, 62 years old, former superintendent of adjacent school district, has been President of Malabar since its founding. There are four Deans: Instruction, Administration, Student Personnel, and Finance. College is divided into usual Divisions (Humanities, Vocational, etc.) and into Departments where increasing size has indicated departmental structure. The four deans are former public school officials, with proper credentials and long experience in their particular fields; and Malabar is their first junior college experience. There are the usual standing faculty committees, with a smattering of ad hoc committees. Just last year, the President appointed a faculty ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of Teaching, with the general mandate "to recommend standards for the evaluation of teaching at Malabar College." The committee has had six meetings, none resulting in recommendations; and there is uncertainty among committee members as to "where" their eventual report should go.

The Specific Situation:

Mrs. Alpha, 56 years old, is Chairman of the Social Sciences Department. She was brought to Malabar in this capacity in the first year of the college, having been recruited by the Dean of Instruction from a large public high school system in a neighboring state. She was known as "outstanding" in her high school work. She received her B.A. in Sociology (with top grades) at a Liberal Arts College in Georgia; her M.A. from a Teachers' College (since turned Liberal Arts) in New York State. Most of her teaching experience was in mid-western high schools, where she nade an excellent record as a "tough" teacher and a "no-nonsense" sub-administrator.

At Malabar College, Mrs. Alpha quickly became known for running a "good, taut ship" in her department, with impeccable records and few "foul ups" in carrying out departmental plans. Mrs. Alpha herself confesses to liberal views (politically) and considers that her department is one of the most democratically run in the college. The agenda file and minutes of departmental meetings are

Case # 1

The Specific Situation: (continued)

both thorough and up to date. The department has 23 members, and they meet regularly once a month. An agenda, prepared by Mrs. Alpha, is circulated at least one week before each meeting.

Mrs. Alpha teaches two courses, in addition to her departmental duties. (The college requires her to teach only one; but she strongly feels that " a department chairman ought to be on the firing line," and "should serve as an example to other members of the department.") Her detailed syllabi and lesson plans are on file and are open to -indeed, urged upon - other members of the department "to examine." One of Mrs. Alpha's favorite phrases is, "carefully planned learning sequences." (Irreverent department members refer to this as "by the numbers."

A current problem in the department is Mr. Beta, 34 years old, in his second year of teaching at Malabar. Mr. Beta has three Masters' Degrees: Michigan (Sociology), Syracuse (Anthropology), and New York University (Psychology); and a wide background of field experience with adolescents and social research in the three cities where he took his post-baccalaureate work. In fact, Malabar College is his first formal teaching experience. Mr. Beta has had no formal education courses. In his first year at Malabar, he followed syllabi, text material, and lesson plans closely - though he did experiment informally, and with groups of volunteer students, in various aptitude tests (known to the students as "Bill Beta's Brain-Buster Quizzes") to determine, as he explained to students, "What kind of people should meet What Kind of Material and When."

However, in his second year (this current academic year) Mr. Beta took off entirely on his own. For about six months, he experimented with methods of classroom precedure, sometimes changing his approach abruptly. With each change, he explained to his class what he was trying to do. He has tried lectures, group discussions, papers presented by students, role playing, team teaching with two other colleagues from the department, integrated teaching involving the application of social science theory to the career curricula in which his students were majoring, the use of varied textbooks (or no textbooks at all, but selected readings from available paperbacks; and even preparing some of the readings himself.) Where, after a few weeks, he found a teaching approach unsuccessful, he dropped it. His short tests and longer examinations were usually problem-centered (not material-centered) and there was always a vocal stratum of student complaint that "the exam wasn't what was in the course."

Mr. Beta is conscientious: always on time to classes and other assignments; always prepared; active as a faculty adviser in co-curricular activies.

Case # 1

The Specific Situation: (continued)

As required by district regulation, Mr. Beta's classes have been regularly "observed" by his chairman, Mrs. Alpha. In her written evaluations, the persistent criticisms have been for his "informality of approach," his loosely planned lesson schemes; and after two different observations, Mrs. Alpha pointed out that he had spent too mush time "over-motivating" the class. Mr. Beta didn't know what she meant. He didn't ask her.

As required by district regulation, Mr. Beta received a carbon copy of all observation reports: the original went to the Dean of Instruction.

Each quarter, a few of Mr. Beta's students (7 or 8 out of 125) complained to Mrs. Alpha that Beta's courses were "too tough." A similar number of students, however, went on record expressing their enthusiasm for his teaching. His flunk-out rate, grade distributions, and other indices, were almost exactly the same as those of other department members.

The department grapevine (a) informed Mr. Beta that Mrs. Alpha was "concerned about him as a teacher," (b) that she had informally "passed the word" that her third-year observation-evaluation reports (i.e., the year tenure decision would be made) were "the toughest," and the implication to Mr. Beta was that a "more regular third year" would make his attainment of tenure "a lot smoother," and (c) that "The Tenure Committee" (composed of Department Heads, Division Heads, and Dean of Instruction) "relied heavily on evidence of clear lesson planning as indicating clear-headed teaching." The Tenure Committee also had the responsibility for recommending promotion-in-rank of tenured faculty.

Mid-way in Mr. Beta's second semester of his second year, Mrs. Alpha arranged to have a formal conference with him (their first formal one) "to go over" his accumulated observation reports and to discuss "his future relationships" with the department and the college.

Before this interview, Mr. Beta talked with most of his colleagues about his evaluations and the implications of his forthcoming meeting with Mrs. Alpha. His fellow-teachers largely agreed that her evaluations were "arbitrary" and her concepts of effective teaching were outmoded. But they also warned him that "Mrs. Alpha is 'in' with the Power Structure around here," and urged him "not to monkey with the buzz saw until he had 'sweated out' one more year until tenure."

In the interview with Mr. Beta, Mrs. Alpha urged on him a formula for creating lesson plans; criticized what she termed his "random approach"; suggested that his examinations "be a more orderly reflection of the material in the text"; and suggested strongly that he use the text employed by the rest of the department, since "the college bookstore lost money if new and different books had to be ordered so frequently." The tone of the interview was wholly "correct" and polite. Mrs. Alpha persistently referred obliquely to "future promotion" standards, but stated that she would "recommend tenure, though the Committee was

Case #1

The Specific Situation: (continued)

not wholehearted." However, Mr. Beta was thoroughly angry. He had, in his view, "kept his nose clean" the whole first year; and then, according to his own intellectual assessment of his teaching situation, he had genuinely sought for better ways of instructing material.

He is considering the following possible courses of action:

1. Going to the Dean of Instruction about his Chairman's statements;

2. Complaining to the Faculty Grievance Committee about the tenure-and-promotion system (and/or "philosophy") of the college;

3. Resigning from his position and going to another college;

4. Fighting the chairman in departmental meetings;

5. Holding on through his third (pre-tenure) year, giving the kind of lesson required by the chairman when she observes him - but continuing with his own methods at all other times.

* * * * * * * * *

--If you were a fellow-faculty member, what would you advise Mr. Beta to do? Why?

--If you were Dean of Instruction, and Mr. Beta came to you, what would you (1) say, (2) do, and/or (3) recommend to Mr. Beta? Why?

--In either case, try to make your response utterly explicit. Explain the "why" of your response thoroughly.

Case # 2

Place:

Windy Hill College, a non-profit two-year college for women, largely residential (650 residents, 75 day students), with a faculty of 72, 8 of whom are part time. Beautifully located on a 190-acre campus in an outer-suburban area about 20 miles from a city of about 850,000, the campus looks and feels like traditional college; settled, landscaped, with long vistas of lawns and trees. Recently completed new buildings (5) provide modern, comfortable facilities of all kinds. Faculty have individual offices, a fine lounge and adjacent conference-and-committee rooms. Standard teaching load is 12 hours. Salaries are good and (apparently) moving toward excellence. The college has recently completed successfully an ambitious fund-raising program, and the financial position of the college is sound.

Under a previous president, much beloved by students, faculty, and alumnae during his tenure of 16 years, Windy Hill developed from an academically "marginal" school to a top-grade liberal arts junior college, whose students increasingly demonstrated superior transfer performance. At the time of his sudden, severe illness and necessary retirement, the president had built an exceptionally strong faculty of 46 people for a student group of about 450. Faculty turnover was almost non-existent; and average faculty service at Windy Hill was nine years.

The new President, George Gamma, was brought in four years ago with a mandate to expand the size and offerings of the college, both as a response to rising demand for admission to Windy Hill (applications were running about four to one) and as a necessary measure to provide an increased income base for the college's immediate future. President Gamma, 44 years old, was previously Assistant to the President of a large state university.

The Dean of the College, Dr. Donald Delta, a veteran of 11 years at Windy Hill, stayed on under the new President, and their relations were immediately cordial and smooth.

President Gamma appointed a Vice President for Development, Mr. James Sigma, within six months. Mr. Sigma, 36 years old, brought extensive fund-raising experience to his new job, together with some background as a college teacher (five years of teaching undergraduate Economics) and as a college Public Relations Officer.

In the past four years, five strong, new programs - with vigorous faculty leadership brought in from "the outside" - have been developed in vocational or pre-professional areas: secretarial, nursing, fashion design-merchandising, Food Planning and Service (Dietetics), and Dental Hygiene. However, liberal arts studies still make up a significant proportion of a student's work, even in these programs (about 25%); and Windy Hill continues to transfer about 55% of all of its graduating students. The initiative for the new programs came from President Gamma and Vice President Sigma.

In the past four years, 30 new or replacement faculty have been hired, 14 of these having the Ph.D. and having been drawn exclusively from university or four-year college teaching.

Case # 2

The Administrative Structure:

President, Vice President, Dean of the College, Business Manager, Dean of Student Personnel, Director of Admissions, make up the President's Council. Faculty matters are channeled to the Council through the Dean. The College has only departments - not divisions. Department heads report directly to the Dean. The Dean is ex officio member of all faculty committees.

The Specific Situation:

Dr. Tom Theta is Chairman of the English Department, which has eight full-time and three part-time members. Dr. Theta has been chairman for six years. He "inherited" three of the senior teachers from a former chairman; but he has either hired - or had a direct hand in hiring - the other eight members. The three senior members have their doctorates; four of the newer people have the Ph.D., while four (full time) junior members, all hired in the last two years, have M.A.'s and considerable additional graduate work, much of it interdisciplinary. On paper, at least, this is a strong department. Dr. Theta teaches one course in literature and one in composition, and he is almost universally considered "the finest teacher" on the campus.

Morale among the three senior members of the department is high. They have tenure, full professor rank (with salary to go with it), and their pick of classes to teach. But for the last three years, these teachers have increasingly tended to make "agreeable arrangements" with one another. They often "covered" each other's classes, informally arranging easier schedules with one another in turn, so that their colleagues could take off on a morning or an afternoon or make a long weekend. They were more than casual about telling Dr. Delta of these arrangements. Usually, they did not. If he knew how often - and increasingly - these arrangements were being made, he didn't say anything to the three men. In department meetings, the three senior members are constantly making a case for small seminars - not more than 15 students - "where teaching-and-learning can be concentrated, intense, productive." Indeed, they have recently been complaining, more and more bitterly, if their classes are scheduled with more than 15 or 16 students, claiming that the "learning experience is diluted."

In the past year, the three men have become notorious for evading college-wide responsibilities - including lateness to class; lateness to proctoring assignments, failure to attend departmental meetings, "forgetting" general faculty meetings. Their excuses are always persuasively, politely, even charmingly given. But the situation now is such that when assignments are given to all faculty for any all-college occasion, the Dean - or whoever is in charge of the particular function - automatically excludes these three, rather than run the risk of having a vacancy to fill at the last moment. Other faculty, who are coming to realize that their assignments may be coming more frequently because of the trio's "arrangements," are expressing resentment - though their complaints are diffuse and are made to individual colleagues.

The effects of this situation, however, have been most heavy on the junior members of the English Department. It is they who have taken on the advisory responsibilities for the college publications (a newspaper, a literary magazine, and a yearbook), some college drama presentations, and the Academic Honor Society. Actually, their assignments in the department have virtually doubled - as they often proctor on short notice, or are called out of office hours to cover a

Case # 2

The Specific Situation: (continued)

class for a late instructor. When other departments were involved with the English Department (as on a Curriculum Committee and an Academic Standards Committee) there was resentment about random attendance at scheduled meetings and little demonstrable work from English Department members on the preparation of reports or recommendations.

Morale in the English Department is poor - even sour. All four junior members say that they are looking for other jobs, (and two of them actively are writing letters and applications.) The part-time members "wonder what's going on," but typically they aren't around enough to "get all the scoop."

It is important to note that this situation has developed slowly - over a period of at least one year, and probably, quietly long before that. There is nothing blatant, insubordinate, or even furtive about the actions of the three senior faculty. In their view, they "do their jobs properly," and "this is, after all, college - higher education - where we don't hold students' hands for them."

These are tenured faculty, of professor's rank. They have taught at Windy Hill for 9, 12, and 13 years, respectively, and are remembered with affection by hundreds of alumnae. If, by reason of tenure and/or community sentiment these older teachers cannot be fired, what can be done in the situation?

Before you too quickly find obvious fault - the Department Head - review the relationships, either stated or implied, in the whole college situation. This apparently "simple" situation has, in fact, a whole complex of roots.

--If you were a member of the English Department, what would you do?
--If you were Department Head, what would you do?
--If you were Dean of the College, how would you act?

--Are there several "solutions" (or resolutions) to a problem like this?

Case # 3

Place:

Northern Branch Community College, an 11-year old institution, with 4000 students (nearly half of these in evening and "extension" divisions), and a faculty of 323, with 62 of these part time. Until two years ago, the college was largely technical and vocational, serving mainly career-oriented students, and awarding the A.A.S. degree almost exclusively. Northern Branch is an urban college, located on two full square city blocks in a half-business-commercial, half-apartment-residential area of a prosperous city of 250,000.

The college has expanded markedly in the past three years. Two years ago, when a new president was appointed, the governing board of the college have him a clear and public mandate to develop a "balanced program" of technical-vocational offerings and liberal arts or general education offerings, as response to well-identified community demand. The new president was vigorous and effective in responding to this charge: college-community relations, always good, became excellent, with many new community-service cultural programs, expanded general education opportunities for adults, and a strong infusion of liberal arts course sequences in previously "pure" vocational curricula. Last year, at its own request, the college had what it called an "interim re-accreditation," and the visiting team's subsequent report was laudatory.

The Administrative Structure:

President, 3 Vice Presidents (Instruction, Student Personnel, Administrative), Dean of Vocational Division, Dean of Liberal Arts Division.

The Specific Situation:

Mr. Epsilon taught mathematics at Northern Branch for eight years: He is, in fact, a "charter faculty member," having been with the college from its opening. Three-and-a-half years ago, he was appointed Dean of the Vocational Division by the Previous president.

As a teacher, Mr. Epsilon was considered by students to be strict but just. He frightened some students by his brusque manner, but most of them felt that basically he had a soft heart. He was - and is - an indefatigable worker, always accepting college responsibilities, willing to take on especially difficult or time-consuming extra assignments. As a faculty member, he never joined faculty "gripe" sessions; and he often cautioned fellow-teachers against pushing for higher salaries, reduction of the 15-hour teaching load and class load, using as his basic argument: "taxpayers will eventually revolt against this more pay for less work business." He is devoted - vocally and often - to what he calls "the community college ideal," by which he means the two-year programs in career curricula "to students of average intelligence." "After all," he often says, "all of us (teachers) are only average, when you get right down to it; and if you don't like working with these students and these 'practical' courses, you should go teach at Harvard or Yale." (This was almost invariably a reply to a younger faculty member in the academic departments who had suggestions or criticisms of the "mix" of liberal arts and vocational programs - or who complained about "low standards.")

Case # 3

The Specific Situation: (continued)

Mr. Epsilon had an M.A. plus 40 hours in mathematics. He kept up with the latest theories in math, and recent developments in teaching methods.

As the college expanded, his seniority - as well as his hard work - recommended him for administrative responsibilities. Within four years, he became a departmental coordinator. One year later, he spent one year as special assistant to the registrar, setting up statistical procedures for admissions and record-keeping that are still in use, substantially as he designed them. Five years ago, he became an Assistant Dean; and three-and-a-half years ago, he was appointed to his present position. To each of his positions, he has brought the habits of high (and increasingly higher) standards and hard, almost unremitting work.

When he was a teacher, and then a department coordinator, he frequently complained (generally at faculty lunch tables and in faculty lounges) that "the way things are going around here, faculty would soon be asking not to work at all - just to have their checks mailed home to them." There were many times when Mr. Epsilon was doing the work of three and four people: his own job and those of one or two other members in his office, because there was usually at least one vacancy - usually more - in his division. He had a hard time keeping secretaries and clerical workers.

The complaints (to colleagues or peers) of all the people who left the division were similar: (1) "He thinks we're back in the Dark Ages;" "He thinks the needs of this community are the same as they were twenty years ago." (2) "He's really horrified at this trend toward the Liberal Arts and transfer programs. He thinks they don't form to the "community college ideal." (3) "He never tells us what's going on. Everything that goes on in 'top administration' is a big secret with him. If he doesn't like a suggestion, he says 'They' won't like it." (4) New teachers - and some not so new - claim that the only ones Epsilon consults, now that he's a Dean, are the "old guard-teachers who started with him." "He must know that some of these people are incompetent; that a lot of them don't keep up in their fields. But he always backs them against us." (5) "No matter what we do, or how hard we work on a special project, he never says 'thanks.' Even an outstanding job, he just takes for granted. "He doesn't care about people. He didn't even ask his secretary where she was spending her vacation; and when she got back, all he said was, 'I hope you got a good rest so you can be ready for a hard year.' And he never said a word to one faculty member who returned to work three days after the death of his father."

Faculty members feel - and there is evidence for this - that Mr. Epsilon won't support anyone in his division for a raise - unless it's a "member of the old guard." Epsilon himself has had consistent raises. Implicit in most of his comments on salary matters is his own feeling that no one really works hard or deserves a raise but himself.

Case # 3

The Specific Situation: (continued)

In almost every case, when a faculty member leaves his division, Epsilon will take that person's classes until a replacement is found - even if "taking the class" is only a "custodial" operation. Faculty turnover in Epsilon's division has been high among new or replacement teachers. The other members of the administrative team are aware of this high turnover.

Mr. Epsilon is 48 years old, a bachelor. His previous teaching experience: mostly high school, with two years as math instructor at the State University before that. He served four-and-a-half years in the Marines in World War II: three years as a D.I. (Drill Instructor) and 18 months of combat in the Pacific. He was twice cited for bravery. He received an honorable discharge (with rank of Staff Sergeant). He used the G.I. Bill to complete his M.A. in math. He took the heaviest course load permitted by the University department, and received his degree "with distinction." Recommendations from his professors repeatedly said, in effect: "Not a brilliant or original student, but an extraordinarily conscientious and meticulous one."

* * * *

--Can you define with some accuracy the potential problem(s) of Northern Branch Community College which may be (and, to an extent already are) caused by Mr. Epsilon?

--As with the previous cases, look at this situation both from the faculty and the administrative points of view, and try to decide what steps could most reasonably and/or effectively be taken, either to forestall problems which may be caused by Mr. Epsilon, or to ameliorate problems which are already there.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 7 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION